

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WEST VIEW RESEARCH, LLC, a
California corporation,
Plaintiff,

v.

BAYERISCHE MOTOREN WERKE
AG, a German corporation;
BMW OF NORTH AMERICA, LLC,
a Delaware corporation; and BMW
MANUFACTURING CO., LLC, a
Delaware corporation,
Defendants.

And Related Counterclaim(s).

Case No.: 14-CV-2670-CAB (WVG)

**ORDER ON MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT ON THE
PLEADINGS**

[Doc. No. 89]

Before the Court is the motion for judgment on the pleadings filed by Bayerische Motoren Werke AG, BMW of North America, LLC and BMW Manufacturing Co., LLC, (collectively, “BMW”). [Doc. No. 89.] BMW argues that United States Patent Nos. 8,301,456 and 8,311,834, which Plaintiff West View Research, LLC (“West View”) asserts against BMW, are invalid because they are not directed to patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. West View opposed the motion. [Doc. No. 90.] For the reasons set forth below, the motion is GRANTED.

1 **I. Background**

2 The '456 patent is titled "Electronic Information Access System and Methods."
 3 [Doc. No. 89-1 at 5-44.]¹ The '834 patent is titled "Computerized Information Selection
 4 and Download Apparatus and Methods." [Doc. No. 89-1 at 46-86.] Both patents are
 5 continuations of United States Patent No. 6,615,175 for a "'Smart' Elevator System and
 6 Method." The common specification discloses a system and subsystems utilizing computer
 7 hardware, software and other peripherals to provide information to occupants in an elevator
 8 or users of other "personnel transport devices," such as moving walkways or shuttles.
 9 Among the many sub-systems described in the specification is a system designed to
 10 identify authorized users and provide them with access or information personalized to the
 11 identified user.²

12 The continuation claims of the '456 and the '834 patents, filed some 13 years after
 13 the original parent application, relate to the disclosed user identification subsystem. The
 14 asserted claims are directed at an information system that uses electromagnetic energy to
 15 identify whether one is an authorized user of the information system. Then, if the system
 16 determines that the person is authorized to access information, the system is configured to
 17 communicate information, perhaps tailored or specific to the person, to a personal
 18 electronic device of the authorized user.³

19 Claim 1 of the '456 patent reads:

20 1. An information system associated with a transport apparatus, the transport
 21 apparatus configured to move from one location to another, the access to
 22 information of said information system being authorized for only one or more
 23 certain persons, the system comprising:

24 an antenna adapted to receive electromagnetic energy, said
 25 electromagnetic energy encoding first data associated with at least one
 26 person; and

27 ¹ Page cites to docket references are to the CM/ECF assigned page numbers.

28 ² The portions of the common specification discussed herein are referenced to the column and line
 29 locations in the '456 patent. [Doc. No. 89-1 at 39-40, Col. 17:46-20:6.]

30 ³ The asserted Claims of the '456 patent are independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 8
 31 and 17.

1 processing apparatus in signal communication with said antenna, said
2 processing apparatus configured to:
3 access a first database containing second data relating to said one or
4 more certain persons;
5 analyze at least portions of said first data and said second data to
6 determine if said at least one person is authorized to access said
7 information; and
8 if said at least one person is authorized access, facilitate download of
9 said information to a personal electronic device (PED) of said at
10 least one person.

11 [Doc. No. 89-1 at 42, Col. 24:38-55.] The asserted dependent claims add these limitations:

12 2. The system of claim 1, wherein the processing apparatus is further
13 configured to enable data communication with the PED before said download
14 occurs.
15 4. The system of claim 1, further comprising an interrogator apparatus
16 configured to elicit transmission of said electromagnetic energy from a radio
17 frequency device associated with the at least one person.
18 6. The system of claim 1, wherein the information comprises information
19 specifically tailored for the at least one person based on more prior preferences
20 or selections of the at least one person.
21 7. The system of claim 1, wherein the information comprises information
22 specific to the at least one person.
23 8. The system of claim 1, wherein the antenna is configured for short-range
24 radio frequency communications with a corresponding radio frequency device
25 of said at least one person.
26 17. The system of claim 1, where in the system is further configured to retain
27 a record of said access by said at least one person.

28 [Doc. No. 89-1 at 42-43, Col. 24:56-25:34.]

29 West View asserts four independent claims of the '834 patent.⁴ Claim 36 and its
30 dependent claims are representative:

31 36. A method of providing information to a user of a portable electronic
32 apparatus, the method comprising:
33

34 ⁴ The asserted Claims of the '834 patent are independent Claim 1 and its dependent claim 4, independent
35 claim 36 and its dependent claim 39, independent claim 52 and its dependent claim 54, and independent
36 claim 66.

1 receiving, via a wireless link, data specifically identifying a wireless
2 device, the device associated with a user of the portable electronic
3 apparatus;
4 based at least in part on the data, identifying at least one information profile
5 associated to that user; and
6 causing provision of information configured according to the at least one
7 profile to the portable electronic apparatus via a data interface;
8 wherein said data is part of a radio frequency (RF) signal emitted at a
9 particular frequency when proper authentication of an interrogation
10 apparatus by said wireless device occurs.

11 37. The method of claim 36, wherein said wireless device comprises a short
12 range radio frequency identification (RFID) device, and the data interface
13 comprises a data interface operating according to a communication protocol
14 different than that of the RFID device.

15 38. The method of claim 37, wherein the portable electronic apparatus
16 comprises application software resident thereon, the software configured to
17 receive the provided information and store it within the storage device of the
18 portable electronic apparatus.

19 39. The method of claim 38, wherein the act of causing provision comprises
20 causing provision of information relevant and useful to the user, the
21 information relevant and useful to the user having been previously selected by
22 the user.

23 [Doc. No. 89-1 at 85, Col. 27:49-28:9.]

24 West View asserts that these claimed systems/methods are an advancement to a
25 computer-specific technology problem, specifically an improvement in the operation or
26 functionality of the computer system to prevent electronic fraud, such as “spoofing” or
27 “man-in-the-middle (MITM) attacks” in wireless interface systems. [Doc. No. 90 at 6-7.]
28 According to West View these problems are addressed by the patents through “various
mechanisms, including (i) use of a short-range wireless protocol (so as to mitigate
interception); (ii) use of e.g., reader authentication; and (iii) optional use of encrypted
data.” [Id. at 7, emphasis in the original.]

BMW argues that the claims of these continuation patents are directed at an
abstraction: retrieving data associated with a user and providing relevant information to
that user in return. Further, according to BMW: (1) the asserted claims provide no element

1 or combination of elements that is significantly more than a patent on that abstraction; (2)
 2 the asserted claims are not new solutions to fraud prevention in wireless interface systems;
 3 (3) the asserted claims do not include limitations of encrypted data protocols, or disclose
 4 any new or improved system or method of doing so;⁵ and (4) the asserted claims do not
 5 recite improvements in the technological function of an RFID tag or advancement in
 6 encoding technology, but employ existing systems and methods in conventional ways.

7 **II. Legal Standard Under Rule 12(c)**

8 Ninth Circuit procedural law for Rule 12(c) motions applies here. *Imation Corp. v.*
 9 *Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V.*, 586 F.3d 980, 984 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (“In reviewing a
 10 grant of judgment on the pleadings, this court applies the procedural law of the regional
 11 circuit.”). In the Ninth Circuit, a “motion for judgment on the pleadings faces the same
 12 test as a motion under Rule 12(b)(6).” *McGlinch v. Shell Chem. Co.*, 845 F.2d 802, 810
 13 (9th Cir. 1988). The standard under Rule 12(b) is a familiar one, and there is no need to
 14 address it at length here. In short, “[t]o survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must
 15 contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible
 16 on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v.*
 17 *Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)); *see also Cafasso, U.S. ex rel. v. Gen. Dynamics C4*
 18 *Sys., Inc.*, 637 F.3d 1047, 1055 (9th Cir. 2011) (holding that the *Iqbal* standard applies to
 19 Rule 12(c) motions).

20 **III. 35 U.S.C. § 101**

21 Section 101 defines the subject matter eligible for patent protection as: “any new and
 22 useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful
 23 improvement thereof.” 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Supreme Court has clarified that Section 101
 24 “contains an important implicit exception: Laws of nature, natural phenomena, and

25
 26 ⁵ Even if a security protocol limitation was included as an element of any of the asserted claims, the
 27 specification does not teach any advancement in the utilization of security protocols. Rather the
 28 specification discloses that “the use of passwords, encrypted data protocols and spread spectrum
 techniques for security is well known in the art, and accordingly will not be described further herein.”
 [Doc. No. 89-1 at 39, Col. 18:14-17.]

1 abstract ideas are not patentable.” *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 134 S.Ct. 2347,
 2 2354 (2014); *see also Mayo Collaborative Servs. v. Prometheus Labs., Inc.*, 132 S.Ct.
 3 1289, 1293 (2012) (“Phenomena of nature, though just discovered, mental processes, and
 4 abstract intellectual concepts are not patentable, as they are the basic tools of scientific and
 5 technological work.”) (quoting *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 67 (1972)). However,
 6 “an invention is not rendered ineligible for patent simply because it involves an abstract
 7 concept.” *Alice*, 134 S.Ct. at 2354. Rather, “applications of such concepts to a new and
 8 useful end . . . remain eligible for patent protection.” *Id.* (internal quotations and brackets
 9 omitted). “Accordingly, in applying the § 101 exception, [the court] must distinguish
 10 between patents that claim the building blocks of human ingenuity and those that integrate
 11 the building blocks into something more, thereby transforming them into a patent-eligible
 12 invention.” *Id.* (internal quotations, citations, and brackets omitted); *see also Potter Voice*
 13 *Tech., LLC v. Apple Inc.*, No. C 13-1710 CW, 2015 WL 5672598, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 11,
 14 2015) (same).

15 “The issue of invalidity under Section 101 presents a question of law.” *OpenTV,*
 16 *Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 14-cv-1622-HSG, 2015 WL 1535328, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 6,
 17 2015). The analysis of whether a patent falls within the exceptions to Section 101 is a two-
 18 step process. In the first step, the Court must “determine whether the claims at issue are
 19 directed to a patent-ineligible concept.” *Alice*, 134 S.Ct. at 2355; *see also DDR Holdings,*
 20 *LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*, 773 F.3d 1245, 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2014). With regard to computer-
 21 related technology, this inquiry concerns whether the claims focus on the specific asserted
 22 improvement in computer capabilities (in this case West View contends an improvement
 23 in electronic fraud prevention in wireless systems) or, instead, on a process that qualifies
 24 as an abstract idea for which computers are invoked merely as a tool. *Enfish, LLC v.*
 25 *Microsoft Corp.*, 822 F.3d 1327, 1335-36 (Fed. Cir. 2016). In some cases involving
 26 computer-related claims, there “may be close calls about how to characterize what the
 27 claims are directed to,” in which case, “an analysis of whether there are arguably concrete
 28 improvements in the recited computer technology could take place under step two.” *Id.* at

1 1339; *see also Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.*, 830 F.3d 1350, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
 2 (“[T]he two stages involve overlapping scrutiny of the content of the claims … [and] there
 3 can be close questions about when the inquiry should proceed from the first stage to the
 4 second”).

5 At step two, if the claims are directed to a patent-ineligible concept, the Court must
 6 “consider the elements of each claim both individually and as an ordered combination to
 7 determine whether the additional elements transform the nature of the claim into a patent-
 8 eligible application.” *Alice*, 134 S.Ct. at 2355. This second step is also known as “a search
 9 for an inventive concept—*i.e.*, an element or combination of elements that is sufficient to
 10 ensure that the patent in practice amounts to significantly more than a patent upon the
 11 ineligible concept itself.” *Id.* (internal quotations and brackets omitted).

12 Although novelty, obviousness and enablement, under §102, §103 and §112 are
 13 separate considerations from a §101 analysis, certain questions relevant to those
 14 determinations overlap with the “search for an inventive concept.” For example: Do the
 15 elements of the claim, individually or in combination, and viewed in the context of the
 16 specification, disclose and teach advancements to the technology to solve the identified
 17 problem? Or, do the claim elements merely use known procedures, or conventional steps,
 18 specified at a high level of generality? *See Market Track, LLC v. Efficient Collaborative*
 19 *Retail Marketing, LLC*, No. 14 C 4957, 2015 WL 3637740, *5 (N.D. Ill. June 12, 2015)
 20 *citing Content Extraction & Transmission, LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat'l. Ass'n*, 776
 21 F.3d 1343, 1347-48 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (discounting “well-known” or long-practiced
 22 procedures and finding no “inventive concept” in claims that “merely recite the use of []
 23 existing . . . technology”).

24 **IV. Analysis**

25 **A. Abstract Ideas**

26 BMW argues that the claims at issue here are invalid under Section 101 because they
 27 are patent-ineligible abstract ideas. “The “abstract ideas” category embodies the
 28 longstanding rule that an idea of itself is not patentable.” *Alice Corp.*, 134 S.Ct. at 2355

1 (internal quotations and brackets omitted). “The Federal Circuit has characterized an
2 abstraction as ‘an idea, having no particular concrete or tangible form.’” *Potter Voice*
3 *Tech.*, 2015 WL 5672598, at *2 (quoting *Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC*, 772 F.3d 709,
4 714 (Fed. Cir. 2014)).

5 The ‘456 patent simply describes the invention as an electronic information access
6 system and associated methods. [Doc. No. 89-1 at 5.] The ‘834 patent describes the
7 invention as methods and apparatus for providing information useful to a particular user of
8 a computerized apparatus. [Doc. No. 89-1 at 46.] The asserted claims are directed at
9 authenticating a user of the system and providing information to that user that is
10 downloaded to the user’s personal electronic device. The claims broadly recite a system
11 employing a wireless device that uses electromagnetic energy as an identifying signal sent
12 to an interrogating receiver, which upon identifying the signal, accesses and provides
13 information associated with the identified user, which is communicated to the user’s
14 portable electronic device.

15 The claim language is result-oriented and functional—requesting a signal from a
16 wireless device; receiving, analyzing and authenticating the response signal; and thereafter
17 providing access to information customized to the user and transmitting that information
18 to that user to be communicated/downloaded to the user’s personal electronic device. The
19 physical components of the claims, such as an antenna or interrogator apparatus, a radio
20 frequency device, a processing apparatus, a personal electronic device are generic
21 descriptions of well-known components used to carry out this abstract function. *See*
22 *Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. Amazon.com Inc.*, 838 F.3d 1266, 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
23 (affirming invalidity under § 101 of claims that set forth routine and generic capabilities of
24 computers that the patentee did not invent, and at a level generality known in the art as of
25 the priority date of the patent).

26 West View describes the asserted claims as inventions that improve the operation or
27 functionality of a computer by “preventing it from being ‘spoofed’ or subjected to MITM
28 attacks and improv[ing] technology in the field of wireless information provision or

1 commerce by enabling secure transactions and preventing release of a user's sensitive data
2 to a malicious third party." [Doc. No. 90 at 7.] Although this description implies inventions
3 that introduce advancements to computer technology addressing a problem specifically
4 arising in the realm of computer networks, it is a fiction. There is nothing in the
5 specification to support this representation that the inventions provide new and improved
6 systems, protocols or methods of securing wireless transactions from interception by
7 unauthorized users. Rather the claims recite known RFID tag and reader systems used to
8 provide authentication of system users for access to information.

9 The asserted claims are directed at identifying an authorized user and providing
10 information to that user. The concept of identifying a system user and then delivering user-
11 specific content to that user's portable electronic device is an abstract idea.

12 **B. Inventive Concept**

13 Having determined that the claims at issue are directed at abstract ideas, the next
14 step is to "examine the elements of the claim to determine whether it contains an 'inventive
15 concept' sufficient to 'transform' the claimed abstract idea into a patent-eligible
16 application." *Alice Corp.*, 134 S.Ct. at 2357 (internal quotations omitted.) An abstract
17 process could be directed to a patent-eligible subject if it discloses a specific improvement
18 in computer performance designed to implement the process. *See McRO, Inc. v. Bandai*
19 *Namco Games Am. Inc.*, 837 F.3d 1299, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016). However, "the mere
20 recitation of a generic computer cannot transform a patent-ineligible abstract idea into a
21 patent-eligible invention." *Alice Corp.*, 134 S.Ct. at 2358; *see also DDR Holdings*, 773
22 F.3d at 1256 ("[A]fter *Alice*, there can remain no doubt: recitation of generic computer
23 limitations does not make an otherwise ineligible claim patent-eligible.").

24 West View emphasizes that the patents claim systems or methods that are an
25 advancement to a computer-specific technology problem, specifically an improvement in
26 the operation or functionality of a wireless computer system to prevent electronic fraud.
27 West View identifies the following claim elements as the purported advancements to the
28 operation of the claimed information system introduced to frustrate interception by a third

1 party: (1) the use of a short-range wireless protocol; (2) the use of reader authentication;
 2 and (3) the optional use of encrypted data.

3 The asserted claims broadly recite wireless devices to interrogate, receive and
 4 transmit signals. When specified in a claim, the only identification and access system
 5 disclosed in the patent consists of an RFID tag, a reader and an access database “of the type
 6 well known in the art.” [Doc. No. 89-1 at 39, Col. 17:49-52.] Independent claim 66 of the
 7 ‘834 patent includes the limitation that the signal sent from the reader/interrogator to the
 8 wireless device (i.e., the RFID tag) and the return signal from the wireless device are short-
 9 range wireless transmissions.⁶ West View asserts that this limitation is an improvement
 10 to the operation of the system intended to mitigate interception by third parties. There is
 11 nothing in the patent, however, to suggest that West View introduced the use of short-range
 12 wireless transmission to RF systems, let alone that West View did so as an advancement
 13 intended to mitigate third party interception of the signals. The patent does not disclose
 14 how such transmissions would operate if they are an innovation to the operation of RF
 15 systems. The specification in fact makes no specific reference to the use of short-range
 16 wireless transmission other than to state that the RFID interrogator/reader “has limited
 17 range and is directional in nature such that it will not interfere with the readers of other
 18 elevators cars nearby or other RF devices.” [Id., Col. 18:23-26.]

19 West View also asserts that the claims introduce the use of reader authentication to
 20 the RF system to frustrate third party interception. However, the asserted claims of the
 21 ‘456 patent do not include as a limitation of the system that the RFID tag authenticate the
 22 transmission from the interrogator before responding. Therefore, this limitation is not
 23 claimed in the ‘456 patent as a purported advancement in an RF identification system. The
 24 asserted method claims of the ‘834 patent do include the step of the wireless device (i.e.,

25
 26
 27 ⁶ The only asserted independent claim of the ‘456 patent, claim 1, does not have a limitation that the
 28 transmission be short-range. It appears in dependent claim 8 of that patent. The other asserted
 independent claims of the ‘834 patent, claims 1, 36, and 52, also do not have this limitation, but it appears
 in their dependent claims 4, 37 and 53, respectively.

1 RFID tag) evaluating or authenticating the signal from the interrogating device to
2 determine if it should respond. [Doc. No. 89-1 at 83-86, Col. 24:66-67; Col. 27:59-62; Col.
3 30:20-25.] The specification discusses this step of the RFID tag authenticating the tag
4 reader before it transmits a response signal as follows:

5 In one embodiment, the RFID tag of the present invention
6 authenticates the tag reader of the access sub-system such that
7 when the tag is interrogated by the reader ..., an appropriate code
8 or password must be provided within the RF signal from the
9 reader for the tag to radiate its RF identification signal. In this
fashion, unauthorized access to the RF signature or emission of
the tag through use of an unauthorized reader are [sic] frustrated.

10 [Doc. No. 89-1 at 39, Col. 17:54-63.]

11 The language of the claims reciting this particular step is generic in its description
12 of the function. The RFID tag “evaluates” or “authenticates” the signal received from the
13 interrogator before responding. The specification describes the manner in which such
14 authentication is performed as providing an “appropriate code or password ... within the
15 RF signal from the reader for the tag to [identify].” Nothing further is disclosed to explain
16 the operation of this step if such a step was indeed inventive. Nor is there any suggestion
17 that the implementation of this step is a concept introduced in these patents as a security
18 innovation for RF signal transmission systems. To the contrary, the specification
19 represents that there are known methods of defeating this authentication process and
20 therefore suggests the optional implementation of encryption protocols to enhance security.
21 [Id., Col. 17:63-18:7.]

22 The last claim element West View identifies as an improvement in computer
23 functionality to solve the problem of electronic fraud in wireless systems is the disclosed
24 optional use of encrypted data in the RF signal transmission system. As noted *supra*, none
25 of the asserted claims include limitations of encrypted data protocols or include a step of
26 encrypting or decrypting data. Even if the Court construes claim language requiring the
27 step of authenticating a transmitted signal configured in a way to frustrate unauthorized
28

1 access [Doc. No. 89-1 at 86, Col 30:4-25] to implicate the use of encryption protocols,
2 there is no disclosure of any new or improved system or method of doing so. Instead, the
3 specification discloses that “the use of passwords, encrypted data protocols and spread
4 spectrum techniques for security is well known in the art, and accordingly will not be
5 described further herein.” [Doc. No. 89-1 at 39, Col. 18:14-17.]

6 West View does not identify anything else that might constitute an inventive
7 concept. The Court is not persuaded by West View’s contention that the claimed systems
8 and methods introduce a security advancement designed to protect the users of portable
9 electronic devices from having their communications intercepted or altered. These
10 wireless communication issues – “spoofing and MITM attacks,” asserted by West View as
11 *huge* computer problems of today⁷ are not the technology problems identified in the
12 patents. Now a decade and a half after the specification supporting these claims was
13 initially filed, West View’s contention that these alleged problems were the motivation for
14 the conception of the claimed inventions is without foundation or even suggestion in the
15 specification.

16 West View’s argument blatantly jettisons any relationship to the actual field of the
17 invention stated in the specification: “the field of personnel transport apparatus, and
18 specifically elevators and similar devices for transporting people from one location to
19 another which incorporate various information technologies.” [Id., Col 1:37-42.] It ignores
20 the only problems identified in the patent as the issues to which these claims relate: the
21 goal of replacing magnetic striped cards and card readers, prone to wear and unauthorized
22 use, as a means of restricting elevator access to certain floors during certain time periods,
23 with RFID systems to “allow for automatic recognition of an individual in order to provide

24
25
26
27 ⁷ As West View itself explains, “electronic ‘fraud’, ‘spoofing’, MITM attacks, etc. are a huge problem
28 today for wireless interfaces” [Doc. No. 90 at 11], but provides no citation to any portion of the
specification of these patents that indicates these were problems in 1999 (when the specification was
originally filed) or that they were the problems addressed by RFID systems claimed.

1 access to certain restricted locations and initiation of certain functions such as lighting and
2 HVAC.” [Id., Col. 2:34-59, 3:15-19.]

3 Untethered to the problems the patent disclosure identifies, these continuation claims
4 are written at a level of abstraction that purports to claim any system employing a wireless
5 device that sends an identifying signal to a receiver, which upon identifying the signal,
6 accesses and provides information associated with the identified user, which can be
7 downloaded to that user’s portable electronic device. Without any reference to actual
8 language in the disclosure required to support its assertions, West View argues that the
9 technological problem being addressed is in the field of wireless information provision or
10 commerce, to enable secure transactions and prevent the release of the user’s sensitive data
11 to a malicious third party. [Doc. No. 90 at 7.] This contention only serves to underscore
12 the level of abstraction of these continuation claims and the intention to preempt a field
13 never contemplated in the patent disclosure.

14 **V. Conclusion**

15 Having considered the submissions of the parties and based on the language of the
16 asserted claims and the specification common to the patents at issue, the Court finds that
17 the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,301,456 and US. Patent No. 8,311,834 are not
18 drawn to patent-eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101 and are invalid. BMW’s
19 motion for judgment on the pleadings is therefore **GRANTED**.

20 It is **SO ORDERED**.

21 Dated: December 30, 2016

22 
23 Hon. Cathy Ann Bencivengo
United States District Judge